

School Psychology SSP

Foundational Competence In School Psychology

Goal Description:

Students develop competence in the scientific, theoretical and conceptual foundations of professional school psychology.

Providing Department: School Psychology SSP

Progress: Completed

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Foundational Competency In School Psychology

Learning Objective Description:

Students demonstrate competency in the scientific, methodological and theoretical foundations of professional school psychology.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II) [Foundational Competence]

Indicator Description:

The PRAXIS II School Psychology Exam is a nationally administered examination used to determine an individual's qualification for licensure to practice within the field. Candidate competency is evaluated with respect to the following four domains:

1. Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery
2. Direct & Indirect Services for Children, Families and Schools
3. Systems Level Services
4. Professional Practices: Practices that Permeate All Aspects of Service and Delivery).

Criterion Description:

A minimum score of 147 is required on this examination to obtain the credential of Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP). Thus, a score of 147 or better has been established by the SSP Program as the criterion for this objective. In addition, candidates are expected to perform at or above the average range provided by the test developers for each of the four subcategories.

Findings Description:

All six third year candidates (100%) passed the Praxis Exam. This examination is administered by ETS for the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and is required for licensure. It serves as the Comprehensive Examination toward completion of the SSP Program.

Attached Files

 [Table 1, Praxis data, 2023.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II) [Foundational Competence]

Action Description:

Faculty will continue to encourage candidates to study for this exam. When candidates have reviewed pertinent materials their performance is noticeably better than when they have not reviewed. There is a new version of this exam, so we will have to learn more about how our students perform on that before we can determine if changes to the curriculum is in order.

Skill Application

Goal Description:

Students develop competence in skill application of professional school psychology in a public school setting.

Providing Department: School Psychology SSP

Progress: Completed

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Skill Application

Learning Objective Description:

Candidates in the school psychology program demonstrate knowledge and improving skill application commensurate with their level of training. Specifically, candidates in their final practicum placement and on internship, both held within the public school setting, will demonstrate appropriate application of professional school psychology skills in the 10 Domains of Professional Practice detailed by NASP.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Faculty Rating of Case Effectiveness

Indicator Description:

Faculty review every case submitted by candidates completing their Internship. The cases are rated by the faculty on both the Case Study Rubric and the Procedural Integrity Rubric.

Attached Files

 [Case Study Rubric.doc](#)

 [A-PIR.docx](#)

 [B-PIR.docx](#)

Criterion Description:

For the Case Study Rubric (CSR), candidates are expected to demonstrate 85% of the actions included in the rubric which demonstrate an effective case intervention.

For the Procedural Integrity Rubric (PIR), candidates should not have any missing case elements and they should meet the minimum cut score for the academic (24) and behavioral (21) cases.

Findings Description:

On the whole, the Academic intervention cases submitted by the candidates completing Internship were not particularly reflective of expectations of competency. Only one candidate was deemed to have submitted an Effective intervention.

Similarly, the Behavioral intervention cases submitted by the candidates completing Internship, although slightly better, were still not reflective of competency. Again, only one candidate was deemed to have submitted an Effective intervention.

Attached Files

 [Table 4 and 5, 2023.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Positive Impact Data

Indicator Description:

Positive Impact Data

Quantitative data gathered as part of the case intervention is to include slope (or rate) of improvement (e.g., R-squared), effect size (e.g., Cohen's d) and/or Percentage of Non-Overlapping Data Points (PND).

Candidates completing the Internship Portfolio assessment will submit quantitative data gathered as part of their two case interventions (e.g., academic and behavioral).

Criterion Description:

Based on the quantitative data included as part of the Behavioral Consultation and Intervention and Academic Assessment and Intervention case submissions, the candidate's impact on student behavior and/or learning can be calculated in a variety of ways. Effect size (e.g., Cohen's d) allows for the comparison of the standard mean difference in student performance during baseline and treatment phases of intervention. An effect size of .8 is considered to be of moderate impact. For academic cases, the slope (R-squared) should be reported. In such cases, a moderate effect of at least 0.09 is expected. Candidates are expected to demonstrate moderate impact through either effect size or PND calculation for both of the cases submitted. Percentage of Non-overlapping Data points, or PND, provides a comparison of the percentage of data points during the treatment phase that do not overlap with the most extreme baseline phase point. A PND calculation of 60% is considered to be of moderate impact. Candidates are expected to (1) accurately report the correct type of quantitative information and (2) demonstrate moderate impact on student outcomes for at least one of the cases submitted.

Findings Description:

For the Academic intervention cases, 4/6 (67%) candidates reported the correct quantitative information. Of the cases submitted, 5/6 (83%) were found to demonstrate a positive impact on student functioning.

For the Behavioral intervention cases, only 2/6 (33%) candidates reported the correct quantitative information. Of the cases submitted, 5/6 (83%) were found to demonstrate a positive impact on student functioning.

Attached Files

 [Tables for Positive Impact Statistics 2023.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Rating Forms and Positive Impact Data

Action Description:

This was the first year to implement the Case Study Rubric. Candidates were not well-versed in the expectations and thus their case reports often did not address important aspects of the rubric.

1. The Internship instructor will share the CSR and PIR documents with candidates at the start of the Fall semester.
2. The Internship instructor will provide feedback on case reports to be submitted prior to the submission deadline.
3. The SSP curriculum will be scaffolded in such a way that candidates are learning about CSR expectations during Year 1 and Year 2, so that they are successfully implementing skills by this Year 3 assessment.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Supervisor Rating of Internship Experience

Indicator Description:

All Interns will be rated by their field supervisors at the conclusion of their Internship experience.

Attached Files

 [Intern Competency Rating Form, 2023 Final.docx](#)

Criterion Description:

The rating scale ranges from 1 to 5, with scores of 1 indicating areas of concern, 2 indicating an area in need of continued development, and scores of 3, 4 or 5 indicating skill competence has been met.

Findings Description:

All six (6) candidates completing their Internship during the 2022-2023 school year were rated by their field supervisors as demonstrating competence in all 10 Domains of Professional Practice.

Attached Files

 [TABLE 3, Intern rating data, 2023.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Action - Supervisor Rating of Intern

Action Description:

Maintaining consistent communication between the Intern and University supervisor as well as between the field and University supervisors will be the focus of ensuring Interns continue to reflect competence in all 10 NASP Practice Domains.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Supervisor Rating of Practicum Experience

Indicator Description:

Each year candidate performance during their final practical experiences will be rated by their field supervisor.

Attached Files

 [Sp 2023 Extern Supervisor Rating Form.docx](#)

Criterion Description:

The rating scale ranges from 1 to 5, with ratings falling at level 2 indicating competence. Ratings of 1 would indicate that a candidate is in need of development in that area.

Findings Description:

All eight (8) students who completed their final practicum during the Spring 2023 semester were rated by their field supervisor as having demonstrated competence for each of the 10 NASP Domains of Professional Practice.

Attached Files

 [TABLE 2, Practicum rating data, 2023.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Action - Supervisor Rating of Practicum Experience

Action Description:

Faculty will continue to support students during their final practical experiences.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement Item

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

Closing Summary

The Specialist in School Psychology (SSP) Program has been functioning admirably for many years. Additionally, the Program has also held NASP Approval and full CAEP Accreditation for many years. The 2022-2023 academic year will mark the first of three years of Program Evaluation data collection that will be the core of the next Initial Report related to maintaining the Approval and Accreditation. Because of this, the following continuous improvement items are planned:

1. To align the Practicum Supervisor rating scale with the most recently updated NASP Standards.
2. To align the Intern Supervisor rating scale with the most recently updated NASP Standards.
3. To align the system of Portfolio case evaluation with the most recently updated NASP Standards.
4. To incorporate all evaluation system pieces within the Tevera system for ease of analysis.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

1. The rating scale completed by field supervisors of practicum students (e.g., Externship) was updated.
2. The rating scale completed by field supervisors of Interns was updated.
3. The evaluation of Portfolio cases was aligned with NASP expectations through institution of the Case Study Rubric.
4. The two supervisor rating scales have been added to Tevera. The faculty rating forms (CSR and PIR) still need to be added to Tevera.

New Plan for Continuous Improvement Item

Closing Summary:

The past year saw significant updates made to the SSP Program evaluation system. These changes will remain in place for two additional years during data collection for our next Initial Report submission related to Program NASP Approval/CAEP Accreditation.

1. All aspects of Program evaluation will be implemented in Tevera.
2. Program faculty will more equally share advising and student evaluation duties.

The SSP Program faculty has lost two valuable junior faculty in the past two years. The Program now has one senior faculty member, a junior faculty member who has completed one year at SHSU and two incoming junior faculty members. There will be much emphasis on faculty support and development during the coming year!